OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY  
ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE  
23 September 2008

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 31st COMMITTEE MEETING 
Held on 26 August 2008 at 18.00 
Old Town Hall, Stratford, 29 Broadway, London E15 4BQ

Present: 
Lorraine Baldry Chairman

Local Authority Members: 
Cllr Rofique Ahmed LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Conor McAuley LB Newham
Cllr Geoff Taylor LB Hackney
Cllr Terry Wheeler LB Waltham Forest

Independent Members: 
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet

Officers in attendance: 
Vivienne Ramsey ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Chris Lelliott ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Mick Gavin ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Ford ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Vanessa Brand ODA, Committee Secretary

1. APOLOGIES 
(AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1. There were apologies from Michael Appleton, David Taylor, and Dru Vesty who were unable to attend the meeting.
4.2. Subject to this amendment the Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 30th Planning Committee Meeting.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. PLANNING APPLICATION 08/90177/REMODA
   (AGENDA ITEM 5)
   Reserved Matters Application for access, appearance, layout and scale of
   Under Bridge U05 providing a partial discharge of details required by
   condition OD.O.19 (submission of details for bridges) and discharge of
   details required by Condition OD.O.59 (foundation details) of Olympic Legacy
   Facilities Planning Permission Reference 07/90010/OUOMODA.
   Land within Olympic Park Planning Delivery Zone 6 to the North West of the
   proposed Velodrome, to the south of the A12 and to the east of the River Lea

5.1. James Lough (Arup) and John Carpenter (Allies and Morrison), presented the
proposals including illustrative drawings on behalf of the applicant for the new
bridge U05 forming part of the main pedestrian access across the loop road
underpass from Eton Manor to the North end of the Olympic Park. The bridge
was needed to serve construction traffic for the Games from January 2009.

5.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered
the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The
application was for partial discharge of details as Reserved Matters under
condition OD.0.19 pursuant to outline planning permission
07/90010/OUOMODA. The bridge was to be a permanent structure used by
pedestrians during the Games and by pedestrians and cyclists in Legacy to
cross the Loop Road just south of the A12 and linking directly to existing bridge
E13 over the A12. Bridge U05 had been designed to harmonise with bridge
E13 and would have a similar section and detailing. The bridges would also
provide access for articulated lorries servicing the EDF headhouse just south
of U05.

5.3. In order to cater for the pedestrian flows during the Games bridge E13 was to
be permanently widened by adding cantilevered footways designed to bear
pedestrians only. This would give the appearance of a traditional road with
lower central roadway and raised footways. The footways would be separated
from the central section of the bridge by high kerbs (standard non-mountable
kerb detail) and railings which would prevent vehicles trespassing outside the
central surface and also prevent pedestrians tripping off the footway. The
existing parapets would be replaced with new solid concrete parapets to shield
pedestrians from the noise and views of the A12 below.

5.4. Members noted that the design of bridge U05 was largely dependent on the
proposals for E13, which had been designed to meet Transport for London’s
(TfL) requirements for segregation of vehicles on bridges. The resulting
treatment of E13 was still subject to discussions with TfL who had to agree the
design and to allow access for construction above the A12: bridge E13 was
therefore not part of the application.

5.5. Members were concerned that although bridge U05 was predominantly for
pedestrian use the design, with its segregated lower central surface, would not
Condition

Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings hereby approved in part (approval not being granted for the concrete kerb sections to the bridge deck, the two metal corner parapets, the metal hand rails to inside of the concrete parapets, the metal balustrade above the kerb to the pedestrian walkway, nor the level and surface treatment of the bridge deck (including the steps shown on the approaches to the pedestrian only walkways) as shown on those drawings), prior to [trigger – date (e.g programmed submission of E13 details) or commencement of above ground development], details of the surface treatment and level of the bridge deck between the 1400mm high concrete parapets shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details to be submitted for approval shall include the design and appearance of the following elements for both Games and Legacy Phases:

i. Any kerb and/or bollard and/or balustrade or other form of structure or treatment which is necessary to delineate the central section of the bridge suitable for cycling and occasional vehicular maintenance traffic ("the Central Section") from the pedestrian only walkways on either side of the Central Section;

ii. The finished surface level and treatment of the whole of the bridge deck (i.e. the whole of the Central Section and the pedestrian only walkways);

iii. The provision of ramped access (to be Disability Discrimination Act compliant) on at least the northern and southern approaches to the eastern pedestrian only walkway;

iv. An alternative design for the two metal corner parapets shown on the drawings; and

v. The hand rails to the inside of the concrete parapets (which shall complement (i) to (iv) above).

The submission of these details shall be accompanied by a study which investigates options for regulating the use of the Central Section by vehicular traffic (including the installation and maintenance of rising bollards across the Central Section of the deck either within the bridge structure or on its immediate approaches). The study shall recommend a preferred option to be pursued and, as appropriate, include the details of the design and external appearance of the preferred option (e.g. rising bollards) for prior approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the bridge is of a satisfactory design and appearance and makes suitable inclusive access provision.

Informatives:

New Informative 1:

The details hereby approved comprise the following:
6. PLANNING APPLICATION 08/90143/REMODA
(AGENDA ITEM 5)
Submission of second stage reserved matters for the Olympic Stadium
(pursuant to condition OD.0.16 of Outline Permission 07/90010/OUMODA) to
provide details of the layout, scale, appearance and external materials of
the Stadium. The submission also provides an indication of how the Stadium is
to be reduced at Legacy Transformation.
Olympic Stadium Site. Land Bounded By The River Lea, City Mills River And
The Greenway, Contained Within Planning Delivery Zone 3A Pursuant To
Outline Permission Ref: 07/90010/OUMODA.

6.1. Ian Crockford (ODA Project Sponsor), Patrick Grincell (Savills) and Tom Jones
(HOK) presented the proposals on behalf of the applicant for the upper parts of
the Stadium, the foundations and lower structure having been approved by the
Committee in March 2008. The proposals were for a temporary structure
which would be dismantled after the Games. Some features of the design
including the fabric Wrap, the roof, and sports lighting had been amended
since Members last saw them. It was now proposed that the Wrap would
consist of vertical panels twisted to permit access, but full details of the
treatment and material would be submitted later. The West stand had also
been amended but remained a temporary structure which would not be
acceptable in its current form as a permanent facility. Illustrative material
including models showed the Stadium in the context of the potential treatment
of the podium and the service 'pods', which would be the subject of separate
later applications. LOCOG, who were working closely with the Stadium team,
would be considering the 'pods' as part of the overall approach to overlay.

6.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered
the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The
application was for approval of the layout, scale, appearance, and external
materials of the Stadium as the second stage of Reserved Matters in
accordance with the planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA which had
granted outline permission for the Stadium and other venues.

6.3. In response to their questions Members noted that:

6.3.1. Cost benefit analysis had shown that it was not financially viable to
install double plumbing for water harvesting from the temporary roof during
the Games.

6.3.2. Proposed Informative 7 addressed the issue of availability of wheelchair
seating in the reduced Legacy stadium. Members also noted that since it
was usual to group spectators together when not all the seats were
occupied, wheelchair users would not be isolated.

6.3.3. The position of the Olympic flame was not part of the application. The
outline permission showed a separate cauldron outside the building but
the proposals allowed for some flexibility in locating the flame on the roof
(similar to the Beijing stadium) if that was required.

6.4. Members emphasised the need for a coherent approach to the appearance of
the Park and the importance of the Stadium setting within that context. They
considered that the design of the 'pods', which might later be recycled
The ODA planning committee in their consideration of the application commented that one way these design objectives could be achieved would be through a design competition. Such a design competition should if possible encourage involvement by smaller architectural practices. Should a design competition not be possible for project programme reasons, the ODA and/or LOCOG are encouraged to utilise established design review processes (such as the CABE/DfL Olympic design review panel) and encourage a diversity of design approaches in the resolution of the selection of the final design which is submitted to the ODA LPA for approval pursuant to condition OG.3

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8. The Head of Development Control was aware that there had been complaints about noise from soil-washing by residents of Hackney Wick but no complaints had been made to PDT. It had been raised with Environmental Health Officers at the public protection forum and it was understood that the situation was under discussion with ODA as the Promoter.

9. Members noted that there would be a briefing session on Tuesday 9 September but that there might not be a Committee meeting that evening. In that case the next Committee meeting would be on Tuesday 23 September 2008.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.40 pm

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 13/11/2009

Chair